

Duke, Daphne

273872

From: Boyd, Jocelyn
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 8:41 AM
To: Duke, Daphne; Easterling, Deborah; Schmieding, Janice; PSC_Attorneys
Subject: FW: Docket 2017-346-E revised with correct date.

From: Sandra keeper [n
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 9:45 PM
To: Boyd, Jocelyn <Jocelyn.Boyd@psc.sc.gov>
Subject: Docket 2017-346-E revised with correct date.

Sandra Wright
 Drive
 Columbia, SC 29210

The Honorable Jocelyn G. Boyd
 Chief Clerk/
 Administrator
 y 3, 2018
 Public Service Commission of South Carolina
 101 Executive Center Drive
 Columbia, South Carolina 29210

RECEIVED
 JAN 03 2018
 PSC SC
 MAIL / DMS

Januar

RE: Docket No. 2017-346-E Petition of South Carolinians Against Monetary Abuse (SCAMA) and Leslie Miner to Direct South Carolina Electric & Gas to show Base Load Review Act (BLRA) Nuclear Debacle Charge on Monthly Electric Bill.

Dear Ms. Boyd:

I am writing in support of the Petition of South Carolinians Against Monetary Abuse (SCAMA) and Leslie Miner to Direct South Carolina Electric & Gas to show Base Load Review Act (BLRA) Nuclear Debacle Charge on Monthly Electric Bill.

I have read the Answer, Motion to Dismiss by SCE&G and I totally disagree with all of their 16 page motion. Their motion is riddled with repetition upon repetition meant to confuse, and their claim that these rate clarifications, as to what is related to Base Load Review Act and what is actual usage on the ratepayers' bills, would be confusing. This is far from the truth.

I claim that if SCE&G places these rate charges in the appropriate manner on the bills, the rate increases for the nuclear reactor debacle will be clarifying rather than confusing. However, if they intentionally place these rate charges in confusing positions or listings, SCE&G can make the rate increase for the nuclear reactor debacle seem very confusing. Therefore, I support Docket number 2017-346-E and respectfully ask

that you allow the petition and refuse SCE&G's motion to dismiss on grounds that any clarification is warranted and sorely needed.

My understanding is that Mr. Tom Clements proposed this same addition to the service bills of the ratepayers some time back and the Commission refused to enforce the changes. But in the light of all of the mismanagement, secrecy, and poor judgment on the part of SCANA/SCE&G in the nuclear reactor fiasco, you should fully take into account the ratepayers and their needs in this matter.

Each of the rate increases on the ratepayers' bills have simply been listed as an increase in the rates. If these increases that were for the nuclear reactor debacle had been listed separately from the beginning, the full amount of the extortion placed on the ratepayers for these charges would be simpler to quantify now that the time has presented itself.

However, if these rate increases for the nuclear reactor debacle were placed on the bills separately from here on, the configuration of costs would and will be much simpler from this date on.

It is my belief that SCANA/SCE&G do not want you to require them to place these rate increases as separate and apart from the actual usage fees because then SCANA/SCE&G would have to admit to the total of the 34% increase from here on!

Respectfully,

Sandra Wright